RSPA-00-7666-47

116581

Regulator/INGAA Meeting on Integrity Management

October 11 & 12, 2000

00 NOV 20 AM 8:50

Washington, DC

Purpose

The meeting was held to review technical input being provided by INGAA in support of defin ng the integrity management process for gas pipelines.

Attendees

Eric Amundsen	CMS Panhandle	ejamundsen@cmsenergy.com
Zach Barrett	OPS	zach.barrett@rspa.dot.gov
Al Bean	SE Alabama Gas	abean@alaweb.com
Dave Berger	KeySpan Energy	dberger@keyspanenergy.com
Terry Boss	INGAA	tboss@ingaa.org
Beth Callsen	OPS	beth.callsen@rspa.dot.gov
John Chin	ANR Pipeline	john.chin@coastalcorp.com
Edward Clark	CC Technologies	ebclark@citynet.net
Andy Drake	Duke Energy	adrake@duke-energy.com
Paul Gustilo	AGA	pgustilo@aga.org
Mark Hereth	HSB Pipelines	mark_hereth@hsb.com
Bruce Hinton	Gateway P/L	hintonb@kochind.com
Dave Johnson	Enron	david.l.johnson@enron.com
Fred Joyner	OPS	frederick.a.joyner@rspa.dot.gov
Keith Leewis	GTI	keith.leewis@gastechnology.org
Bob Linney	Air Products	linneyre@apci.com
Dennis Lloyd	WA UTC	dlloyd@wutc.wa.gov
Jose Lozano	Okaloosa Gas	joselozano@emeraldcoast.com
Gavin Nicoletta	NY DPS	gavin_nicoletta@dps.state.ny.us
Ed Ondak	OPS	edward.ondak@rspa.dot.gov
Joe Pikas	Williams	joseph.l.pikas@williams.com
Roy Pugh	Duke Energy	roypugh@earthlink.net
Rodrick Seeley	OPS	rodrick.m.seeley@rspa.dot.gov
Bernie Selig	HSB	bernd_selig@hsb.com
Eddie Smith	KY PSC	ebsmith@mail.state.ky.us
Ted Van de Kamp	Reliant Energy	tvandekamp@reliantenergy.com
Mike Web	Baseline Tech	mikew@baselinetech.com
Paul Wood	Cycla	paulw@cycla.com
Albino Zuniga	NM NAPSR	albino.zuniga@state.nm.us
John Zurcher	Columbia Gas	jzurcher@ceg.com

Summary of Discussions

HCA (High Consequence Area) Definition: Discussion on the HCA definition included the INGAA observation that no definition would be complete or responsible if it didn't explicitly include use of the current information on population near gas pipelines required by the class location regulations. OPS indicated that it would also be prudent to include population groups with impaired mobility located further than 660 ft from the pipeline (e.g., child care facilities, primary schools, assisted living facilities, hospital, or prison). All parties recognize the need for the HCA definition to be presented in a map-based format.

Direct Assessment: The discussion focused on the capability of Direct Assessment to identify the potential for external corrosion or damage. A plan to validate the technology against pigging techniques was presented, and the impact of the non-proceduralized application of both Direct Assessment and pigging on the validation process was discussed. The industry is considering supporting the long-term validation process needed to increase the confidence in Direct Assessment technologies.

Low Stress Piping: The stress level below which pipe failure is predominantly by leak rather than rupture is being explored by Battelle. The 30% SMYS level appears to be in the range where the failure modes change. AGA will continue its work to link insights from the failure mode analysis to identify demonstrated techniques that provide additional assurance of integrity. The current code should be reviewed to determine its adequacy in the light of technical findings reported in this study.

Focus of IMP: INGAA indicated that its efforts are focused on an overall process for managing threats to pipeline integrity rather than simply techniques for detection of incipient failure. This *management process* includes: (a) assessment of the system for potential integrity concerns, (b) identification of the potential threats, (c) identification and implementation of preventive measures, (d) application of detection techniques, and (e) repair or replacement of pipe as needed.

Consensus Standards: INGAA is planning to develop twelve standards to support improvements in integrity management. The schedule for these standards will be discussed at the next meeting. The proposed standards are:

- Corrosion Assessment
- Dent and Gouge Assessment
- Hydrostatic (Pressure or Strength) Testing
- Smart Pigging
- Direct Assessment
- Stress Corrosion Cracking Assessment
- Internal Corrosion Control
- External Microbiologically Induced Corrosion (MIC)
- Corrosion Control Monitoring Techniques
- High Consequence Affected Area Determination

- Integrity Management Development Guide
- Risk Based Integrity Management

Potential Code Changes: INGAA has presented technical information for OPS consideration in support of changes to the current code, either by putting in place an integrity management rule for high consequence areas, or by ensuring the code is updated so it continues to reflect up-to-date technical knowledge. The code should represent a comprehensive integrity management program for all gas pipelines, not just those in HCAs. INGAA continues to expect that any new integrity management rule will include both a prescriptive set of requirements and an option for a "performance-based" compliance approach.

Communication with States: Discussion on initiatives by several states (including Texas) to institute their own integrity management requirements led to the conclusion of the need for more effective communication with all states on the technical information being prepared and presented by INGAA in the current series of meetings with OPS.